



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/005,035 01/09/98 LAW

F 038007/0112

FOLEY AND LARDNER  
SUITE 555,  
3000 K STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON DC 20007-5109

HM12/0127

EXAMINER

BECKERLE, A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1632

DATE MAILED:

01/27/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/005,035

Applicant(s)  
Peter Law

Examiner  
Anne Marie S. Beckerleg

Group Art Unit  
1632



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anne Marie S. Beckerleg

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Stephen Bent

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jan 5, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 20-32

Identification of prior art discussed:

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

A message was left with the applicant's representative clarifying the status of the instant application. The applicant was informed that although a restriction requirement was mailed on 5/7/99, with a maximum response date of 11/7/99, the case has not been abandoned as two preliminary amendments filed on 1/9/98 by the applicant had not been entered into the case. These amendments resulted in the cancellation of the claims subject to the restriction requirement mailed by the office and resulted in the addition of new claims 20-32 which are directed solely to an automated cell processor. The applicant's representative was further notified that pending claims 20-32 are not subject to a restriction requirement. However, due to the subject matter now claimed in the instant invention, the application would be forwarded to the appropriate art unit for action on the merits.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.